

# Social Progress



Are We Afraid of Peace? . . . MAX LERNER

The World Crisis . . . JAMES P. WARBURG

OCTOBER 1948

# Social Progress

---

## DIVISION OF SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION

PAUL NEWTON POLING, Secretary and Editor; CLIFFORD EARLE, Associate Secretary; FERN M. COLEBORN, Assistant Secretary; and WILLIAM H. McCONAGHY, Director, and JESSE BELMONT BARBER, Associate Director of the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations.

---

## CONTENTS : OCTOBER, 1948

Articles	PAGE
Are We Afraid of Peace? <i>by Max Lerner</i> .....	1
Universal Training for Democracy, <i>by Chester Bowles</i> .....	5
On Rethinking Democracy, <i>by H. Richard Rasmussen</i> .....	9
Strategy of Error, <i>by S. Andhil Fineberg</i> .....	12
The United States and the World Crisis, <i>by James P. Warburg</i> .....	18
 Editorial Comment	
An Appeal to Faith.....	16
 Christian Action .....	
	23
 Sanctuary .....	
	28
 About Books .....	
	30

*Articles represent the opinions of the authors, and not the official policy of the Division of Social Education and Action or the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*

---

Published monthly, except July and August, by the Division of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan Street, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, \$1.00 a year; three years for \$2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request. Copyright 1948 by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

# Are We Afraid of Peace?

MAX LERNER, *of the New York Star, analyzes underlying forces, in the second part of his presentation to Presbyterian Peace Conference.*

ARE we afraid of peace? I think we are. There is a real struggle going on inside the State Department and the Administration, between the group that does want to sit down and talk things over with the Russians and some other groups which I think are determined to smash the Russian will before we sit down to talk peace. So the peace conference then becomes a conference between the victor and the defeated. A very famous article written by the head of the planning division of the State Department, and signed "Mr. X," presumably gave the basic philosophy of the State Department, and I take that article very seriously. It has never been denied. Mr. X gave an interesting, philosophic analysis of Russian ideology and Russian policy and said that America would never be safe until the Russian government has been overthrown. As I understand it, that is part of what we're waiting for before we talk peace.

The effort is to smash the Russian government by pressures from outside. You put pressures all around them—that's part of the Truman doctrine. You fight them at every point—Greece, China, Italy, or whoever it may be. You use economic strength, as we are doing. You withdraw economic aid from any country that shows any kind of sympathy toward Russia, which we are doing. If we put enough pressure on those people, we will get a collapse of the Russian regime.

Then there's another group that believes time is on our side, that

the longer we wait before we sit down with Russia, the better off we shall be. Because of our tremendous economic strength and the relative economic weakness of the Russians they will not be able to hold their part of the world together. More and more the doubtful groups will come over on our side. So the strategy is to protract the pooling of the armed troops and delay and postpone the period of negotiation.

The third group is the preventive war group. They, I think, are the smallest in number, but are very powerful. They are the group that says inside of three or four years the Russians will have the atom bomb in mass production. We can't wait until then because they may use it on us, so let's use it as quickly as we can on them. I think, myself, that the whole military group of this country, if it were not restrained, would like nothing better than a preventive war against Russia because they are convinced that this is the period of our maximum power and of the Russian maximum weakness. And if there is going to be any time when we could win a war, this would be it. This is what I call the militarizing of American political policy. It is being decided now, not in terms of our diplomatic tradition, but in terms of what a particular decision will do with respect to our position in a war. The decision on Palestine was made by military men as part of the militarizing of political policy. The people were assured that we would live up to partition. The last minute, the word came down that we would not. I say "came down," because I think the military group, the "four-star" Leahy-Marshall-Forrestal group, made up its mind that we couldn't afford to estrange the Arabs in the Middle East, for there are thirty or forty million of them there and only three quarters of a million Jews. If it's going to be a problem of a war with Russia, we've got to have Arab oil and Arab numbers on our side. So they were willing to betray American honor and American commitment on Palestine.

That was a deadly blow dealt to the UN. It is very difficult for the UN to survive as a force when it is in the humiliating position of having to backtrack on one of its own decisions. Trygve Lie, head of the UN, made an interesting remark the other day: that there had been three blows dealt to the UN—one was the veto, the second was the by-pass, and the third was the back track. The veto, which the Russians have used; the by-pass, which we used on Greece; and the back track, which we used on Palestine. Now you ask yourself, How could we have done this to the UN which is part of our hope for peace? Of course the answer is, We did it because political policies today are no longer political—they're military.

That basically represents our dilemma today. I don't know of any other way to break it except by firmly grasping one of the three alternatives—world law. World empire, to my mind, is impossible: impossible in the sense that it will destroy us and impossible in the sense that it would involve us in war. This would lead to world chaos, which also is impossible. I assure you America could not emerge the victor. Neither American capitalism nor American democracy, nor Christendom, nor freedom, nor any of those things.

That's why I feel that the nature of the crisis has been misrepresented. A really adequate analysis shows us that we can't fight these things with guns, with weapons, with atom bombs, with bacilli. You can't shoot ideas that way. Even assuming that Communism is the enemy it is depicted, you can't meet the enemy in that way. Once you are geared in this kind of struggle for world power you become the very thing you're trying to fight. We become what we are trained to struggle against. We are today becoming totalitarians—the walls are closing in on us as never before. There's becoming less and less chance to exert the vigor of an independent mind into independent thinking. The test is no longer, "Is this the truth?" The test of an idea has become, What effects will this have upon our struggle with

Russia? The test is no longer, Are Negroes being given the run-around? The question now is, If you talk about Negroes in this country, what happens to our struggle with Russia? The test is no longer, Is lynching the moral crime that it is? The question has become, If you talk about lynching, aren't you giving aid and comfort to the enemy? The test is no longer, Should American Negroes have a chance not to have their hearts broken by discrimination practiced against them in colleges and universities? To me that's a very big thing, because what we will be in this country will depend upon what we do to our youngsters. But we are breaking their hearts by that discrimination, yet that no longer is the thing to say, because you give aid and comfort to the enemy.

We find ourselves being weakened in the fiber of our own democratic institutions and our own democratic impulses. Weakened in the one thing that America really has, which is part of its greatness, of the original conception of our democracy—brotherhood. But you're supposed to be ashamed nowadays to breath the word. Mr. Forrestal doesn't like the word; he thinks it is sentimental and silly. But I like the word. To me it is the essence of democracy. All over the world there are a lot of people who are beginning to understand that either we will live like brothers or we'll die like beasts.

---

### Christian Rural Overseas Program

CROP is a plan, sponsored by Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and Catholic Rural Life, through which gifts in kind are accepted from American farmers and distributed to the needy overseas. Purpose is to feed the hungry, speed rehabilitation, and build toward a better world.

Distribution overseas is handled through church agencies. Most of the agencies have been set up for some time. The administrators are competent and experienced. They know where the greatest need is. So, you may be assured that whatever you give will reach those who actually need it most. No discrimination will be made because of creed or nationality.

# UNIVERSAL TRAINING FOR DEMOCRACY

**CHESTER BOWLES** *proposes a program to educate youth in special skills, for peace or war.*

ONLY the lightheaded can question the fact that we are faced with a world crisis. Three years after V-J Day the major peace treaties remain unsettled, and Russia and America are wrapped in a power struggle out of which anything, even a third world war, may develop.

The situation presents us with a serious dilemma. If we fail to provide adequate military defenses, we may become victims of a sudden attack. If we become too obsessed with the search for military security, we may end up as a militarized nation of 140,000,000 neurotics. Only by the exercise of cool judgment and the constant review of our ultimate objectives can we avoid the danger of military weakness on the one hand and the garrison state on the other.

What are the standards by which our national defenses should be judged? Obviously, our armed forces must be strong enough to discourage a sudden attack on American territory. Most of us will agree that until present tensions diminish they must also be sufficient to convince others that we are prepared, if necessary, to defend our world position by force.

In the last few weeks, the Army, Navy, and air forces have outlined our military needs as they see them, and, for the most part, their recommendations have been accepted by Congress. Only one important recommendation was rejected—universal military training.

UMT has been attacked for many different reasons. Some opponents argued that it would gradually militarize the coming generation. Others have pointed out that it would disrupt normal education and family life. Still others, who oppose UMT on military grounds, have emphasized that it would require 250,000 trained officers and men to operate the program and that much of the training would be wasted in terms of "readiness potential."

Let us grant that by spending between two and three and one half billion dollars annually we can teach our eighteen-year-olds how to fire a rifle, obey military commands, and execute the simpler field maneuvers. Let us also grant, in spite of the dim view taken by military experts, that such training will make us still stronger in a military sense.

But can we safely assume that our

national security over a period of years rests solely on military power? Can a peaceful future for ourselves and the world be assured solely by armed force, regardless of how high our defense walls may be?

The outcome of the struggle between East and West will be deeply affected by our military power or by our lack of it. In the next ten years, however, it may be affected even more profoundly by the following factors:

1. Our ability as a free people to understand and to cope with the complex world in which we are living and to develop the enlightened public opinion on which a democracy must depend.

2. Our ability to eliminate the racial prejudices which cause hundreds of millions of black, brown and yellow citizens of the world to view our demand for political democracy abroad with understandable cynicism.

3. The health of our people, mental as well as physical.

4. The number of American men and women who possess those skills essential both in war and in peace.

5. Our ability to establish high minimum levels of economic security for all our people, and to maintain full production and full employment.

Let us review briefly some of the areas in which we must strengthen the social and economic fabrics of our challenge of this tense and ex-

plosive world. Let us take education. Totalitarian countries, such as the Soviet Union, have developed educational systems which produce a relative handful of eminent scholars, plus a mass of literate but uncritical citizens, incapable of thinking for themselves.

Obviously, our educational needs are vastly different. The very survival of our form of government depends on an educational system which turns out enlightened, individualistic, imaginative citizens, who understand both their democratic rights and their democratic responsibilities. We are still a long way short of this goal.

Our low standards in general education are demonstrated in many ways, notably in our arrogance toward "backward" people, in our widespread ignorance of history and economics, and in the uncritical acceptance on the part of many of our people of even the most lurid forms of propaganda.

The shortcomings of our educational system are repeated in the field of public health. Although experts agree that we need a minimum of one public-health nurse for every 2,000 people, our national average is one for every 7,000, and in one state it is one for every 25,000.

We have too few dentists, too few doctors, too few hospitals—and those we have are unevenly distributed. In 1940 the League of Nations research department stated that, in

spite of our position as the world's wealthiest nation, we ranked no higher than fifth and as low as thirteenth among all nations in various health comparisons.

If we are to meet the responsibilities that confront our democracy in the next generation, we must develop a new confidence in ourselves, a new sense of strength based not on our ability to destroy but to create.

What we need is not a plan for universal military training but for universal training in democracy—a program that will strengthen the essential fabric of our nation and prepare us as a people for the broad economic, social, and political responsibilities that we must face.

Since our greatest strength will always lie in an enlightened citizenry, let us boldly attack the problem of democratic education. Let us offer each boy and girl who is intellectually qualified two years of college on the same free basis as our present elementary and secondary school system.

An additional two years of college would be made available at sharply reduced costs to those who meet reasonable standards. Free scholarships would also be made available to high-standing students for further study in law, medicine, dentistry, public health, and the ministry. The number of these free scholarships would depend on the needs in each field, and it could be varied as conditions change.

All college students who specialize in medicine, public health, engineering, dentistry, teaching, science, or the ministry would incur no special obligation in return for free college instruction. Students taking general liberal arts courses would be required, however, to select one of the following fields for special training:

1. Four years of Reserve Officers Training Corps at college.
2. Training in one of several fields, such as radar, radio, civil aviation, nautical astronomy, nursing, secretarial work, aviation mechanics, etc.

All boys and girls who have finished high school or reached eighteen and do not choose to go to college, or who cannot meet the college standards, would be offered a wide choice of special courses available in their own communities without charge. In addition to the specialized training available to liberal arts college students as an alternative to ROTC, they would choose training in farming, forestry, or engineering. All boys who enlist in the armed services would be offered similar opportunities for education and for special training to assist them in broadening their opportunities when their enlistment expires.

College students of normal college age today represent only sixteen per cent of their age group—the same percentage as in 1939. In contrast to this, forty-nine per cent of all young men and women are capable

of absorbing two years of college work, while thirty-two per cent are capable of meeting the four-year requirements for graduation. This means that today, in the richest country on earth, there are more boys and girls of superior intellectual ability out of college than in college and almost wholly for economic reasons. Clearly, this does not represent "equality of opportunity" in education. What it does represent is a waste of our human resources.

The argument that this proposed program would subject our institutions of higher learning to Federal control does not hold water. Each student would be free to select whatever college he chose, an advantage generally denied him at elementary and secondary school levels.

The total cost of this program runs into large figures. But even in the year 1960, when this program would reach its peak, and including the specialized training for the young men and women who cannot or do not go to college, the annual total cost will be less than that of UMT.

In other words, it will cost our taxpayers less to give half of all our young men and women a minimum of two years of college education and to give all of them training in one or more essential skills than to provide a year of military training for our young men alone.

The advantages of this program over UMT seem obvious. It is a civilian program—free of militaristic

trimmings. And yet it is a preparedness program—whether the future be one of peace or war. If, in peace-time, we lose the ideological competition with Communism for the support of the masses all over the world, it will be because we have placed our faith in bombs rather than in education and ideas.

If, in the twilight between peace and war, we lose our liberties, it will not be to other nations but to other Americans; to military-minded men who argue strangely that we must sacrifice individual freedom in America in order to promote the cause of freedom overseas.

If for any reason we stumble into war, it will be a long and bloody affair and the ultimate decision will depend on the vigor of our industrial system, our individual skills, our organizational ability, and the depth of our conviction—rich and poor, black and white—in the cause for which we are fighting.

Our ability in the next ten years to build a peace of reason and understanding will depend on the intelligence of our people and their ability to cope, as free citizens, with a tense and complex world. Our strength will lie, not in hordes of disciplined, unthinking young men competent with pick, shovel, and rifle, but on the development of a new and well-educated generation, which has the capacity to put aside the inadequacies and fears of its fathers and to grasp the future with both hands.

# ON RETHINKING DEMOCRACY

*By H. RICHARD RASMUSSEN, minister, University Presbyterian Church, West Lafayette, Indiana.*

WORDS, like coins, can be so bandied about that they need reminting. This has happened to words like "liberty," "freedom," "democracy." Ever since the rise of Hitler in Europe, and now Stalin in Russia, we have been talking a great deal about democracy. But how many of us have given much thought to what it means?

## Democracy Needs Christianity

First of all, "Democracy is the political expression of the Christian feeling for life." It was Thomas Mann who said that.

That democracy is more Christian than dictatorship is clearly seen in their respective approaches to persons. Dictatorships teach and practice that persons exist for the state. So Hitler spoke of the common people as "ballot cattle." Democracy teaches and, when true to its underlying philosophy, practices that the state exists to serve the person. Democracy therefore must define politics as "the art of human life and happiness." And so Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

This Christian feeling for the

worth of persons takes us farther. Jesus took a child and put him in the midst, thus saying that life must serve the person and that institutions exist for him, not he for them. So must democracy become concerned with the problems of decent homes, food, medical care, recreation, soil conservation, efficient distribution of necessary goods, and the right to work for a living wage. Each of these is a practical expression of the Christian feeling toward life. Ultimately, political democracy must flow out into economic democracy. A man from Texas was asked what he wanted from the war. He replied, "Free speech and groceries." Not bad! Democracy must be concerned with groceries as well as freedom, if it hopes to survive.

## Democracy Needs Minorities

Consider again, that "democracy is belief in the right of the majority to rule and the duty of the minority to criticize." How often we have heard it said, "Democracy is the rule of the majority"! But that's only a half-truth, and not the most important half. Democracy is not so much the rule of the majority as it is the freedom of the minorities; the freedom to think, criticize, and oppose.

It is very possible that if a democratic election were held in Russia tomorrow the dictatorship regime would win the election. But that does not make this government democratic, because there is no freedom for minorities to criticize and oppose and work to become the majority. Democracy is less the rule of the majority and more the rights of the minorities, and it has been said, "Even the liberty of the majority must be qualified in order that the liberty of the minorities may be preserved."

Over the radio recently a speaker pointed out that logically this minority-opposition idea looks crazy. He said, "We set up a government and then actually pay salaries to opposition party members in the legislatures to criticize and obstruct the government." But it is magnificent too, for we want all sides of every issue to be brought into the open. The British use the expression: "His Majesty's Loyal Opposition." Without this no genuine democracy is possible.

### Democracy Needs All Men

Pushing on farther, consider that "democracy is a way of living based on respect for all people." Theodore Parker once said, "Democracy meant not 'I'm as good as you are,' but 'You're as good as I am.'" So the Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men"—not Americans only, not whites only—but "*all men*"

are created equal, having certain inalienable rights.

In a genuine democracy every person will be treated as an individual and not as a member of a racial, national, or religious group. Setting Catholic over against Protestant, and Jew over against either, is not democratic. Intolerance and prejudice toward the Negro or Mexican or Japanese is not democratic. Democracy is interested not in labels, but in worth. The quality of each man in terms of intellect and character and spirit is what counts. The only aristocracy which democracy can believe in is the aristocracy of "talent and achievement."

Because in the United States we are made up of many cultural groups—fifteen million Teutonic; nine million Slavic; five million Italian; one third of a million Oriental, Filipino, and Mexican; sixty million Anglo-Saxon; thirteen million Negro; ten million Irish; four million Scandinavian; two million French; one million each, Finn, Lithuanian, Greek; one third of a million Indian—we must learn to co-operate for the general welfare, and we cannot when the air is thick with suspicion. A unity that refuses to be divided by distrust is democracy. For Clarence Darrow, America was an experiment in co-operative living by groups of folks who didn't agree with one another on all issues but were willing to accept these differences with good will.

## Democracy Needs Responsibility

Finally, democracy is a bill of duties. Of course it is a bill of rights too. We are all familiar with our guarantees of free speech, free press, free assembly, and the rest. But we need to be told now that democracy is also something to be served.

A letter by a French workingman printed in a New York paper shortly after the fall of France said: "We have lacked an idea. We came to imagine that the proper duty of man was to arrange an easy way of life, individualistic to the point of selfishness. We saw no farther than the village pump. We looked upon the state as a universal purveyor, and we always spoke of our due, seldom of our duties . . . and [imagined] that the state would prove an everlasting milch cow. Tell this to the Americans and warn them at the same time of the peril that may befall democracy everywhere when it forgets that free men have duties as well as rights."

Wilfred Grenfell wrote: "The only

real heathen and heretics are the purely selfish. It is for our own sakes as well as theirs that we desire their conversion. For while they are losing all life has to give, we are losing the share they might contribute."

Here we have the right of freedom in worship. But who is not aware of how this right can be misused, and freedom of religion become indifference to religion? Here is the right of free speech. But how that does impose upon us the obligation to read wisely and think clearly, in order that when we speak we use this freedom justly and with benefit! Here is freedom of assembly. But it can descend into disloyal agitation.

One of the reasons historians give for the decay of the Roman republic is that education failed to instill in the minds of its citizens "the idea of service and obligation to the republica." May it not be so of us. For Gilbert Murray has said that democracy means that "each man, as a free human soul, lives of his own free will, in the service of the whole people." May this be so of us.

---

**Written by the minister of Westminster Presbyterian Church, South Bend, Indiana, this statement was concurred in by twenty-two other ministers:**

"We denounce the wholly needless peacetime military draft as one of the greatest deceptions ever to be perpetrated as a law upon the American people. We shall miss no opportunity to work for the restoration of civilian rule and the repeal of this law that has at last fastened militarism upon our democracy and is leading it down the same path to war and destruction that we have witnessed in our former enemies, Germany and Japan, whom we have now strangely emulated. . . . We call for the repeal of this evil instrument borrowed from the oppressions of the past."

# STRATEGY OF ERROR

By S. ANDHIL FINEBERG

THE *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, in the article on anti-Semitism, lists several methods that have been employed in opposing it. The first is "refutation of accusations." This is a traditional method of Jewish defense. Ever since Josephus replied to Apion's anti-Semitic diatribes, the hope has persisted that security against slanderous attacks upon Jews can be won by issuing apologetic books, pamphlets, and articles.

To reply to each slanderous "charge" against the Jews was the accepted practice of German Jewry until Hitler did away with the Zentral-Verein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens and the Philo Verlag. It is saddening to read the numerous books and pamphlets—chief among them, the famous *Anti-Anti*—in which Jewish scholars brilliantly exposed the fictions invented by charlatans. But their activity lagged far behind Nazi capacity to fabricate new libels. The situation called for more heroic measures. It seems now that the most futile method of stopping the yelping of the Nazi pack was to publish an appropriate answer to each bark.

British Jewry has likewise produced "answers" to "charges." Among the apologetas appearing in

Britain are such pamphlets as *Jews Are News*, *The Jews—Are They Human?* and *The Jews—Some Plain Facts*.

One very plain fact is that the titles given to some of these defensive booklets are costly to Jewish prestige. Some of the apologists are either unable to apply even elementary psychology in finding titles for their output, or else they are so anxious to gain attention that they stress the very notes that anti-Semites themselves wish to strike. "The Jews—Are They Human?" is a favorite theme of Jew-baiters, who recognize their advantage in merely raising the question of whether or not Jews should be included in the human race.

Collections of anti-Jewish calumnies and refutations of each have been published in the United States and in Canada. The number of such publications is relatively few, but their circulation is tremendous. The accelerating request for "disproof" literature, which is generally furnished free to non-Jews, makes a mockery of the idea that "the answers" should be published for the sake of the "few friends" who want this information. Once these "answers" are printed and their existence is known, no positive book on

Jewish values can compete with it for a ready audience. *The Jews of America, Facts About Fictions Concerning the Jew, and To Bigotry No Sanction* are among the defensive and negative items now rapidly finding a place in every library in America. They cost the libraries nothing. They may cost the Jews dearly.

In some of the smaller libraries connected with various educational and religious institutions, especially in areas remote from Jewish centers, it is possible to discover what the Jews are alleged to be, but are not. For lack of positive books distributed with equal zeal and generosity, it may be impossible to find out in the same libraries what the Jews are. This state of affairs results from the theory that someone might come to the library weighed down by a doubt about the Jews because of certain scurrilous things he has heard about them; and that once he has obtained disproof of "the charges," this troubled person will correct his impressions and fare forth into the world much more friendly to the Jews. No record of such conversions has been kept. Possibly they have not occurred.

### The Practice of Others

We might ask, To what extent have other organized racial and religious groups devoted their funds and energies to the production of defense literature?

The catalogue of the New York

Public Library contains hundreds of anti-Catholic items. One seeks in vain for replies to these. Catholic authorities evidently do not furnish disproof literature, even though here and there some individual Catholic or a relatively small group of Catholics may launch an abortive defense. To Catholics, "apologetics" means converting others to Catholicism. Nor, evidently, do the other religious groups in America assume that they are accountable to those who attack them with malice and fraud. Quakers, Mormons, Lutherans, and other groups have stanchly defended their dogmas and doctrines by spoken and printed word. But they have answered with silence any aspersions on their conduct and character. They assume that the burden of proof is on their accusers and that it is sufficient reply to ask, "Where's his proof?" These groups have probably learned that none are more likely to be insulted than those who invite others to discuss insults with them. Honor does not require that we debate dishonorable indictments of a whole people.

There are some infamous anti-Semitic "documents" and "accusations" as to which the facts should be, and have been, thoroughly explored. *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* have been exposed as a rank forgery. The Benjamin Franklin forgery is in the same category. It is enough to be able to report, when and where advisable to do so, that

the Franklin Institute denies the authenticity of anti-Semitic statements imputed to Benjamin Franklin and allegedly contained in "The Journal of Charles Pinckney," falsely said to be found in the Franklin Institute. Instead of such a denial—ample for its purpose—a pamphlet, *Benjamin Franklin Vindicated*, is offered, wherein the forgery is reprinted conspicuously. This bit of disproof literature can obviously be used by anti-Semites as a handy text from which to reprint the alleged "prophecy" of Franklin. A pernicious screed, *The Key to the Mystery*, quotes genuine Jewish sources in support of insidious anti-Semitic statements, failing to mention that the Jewish writers were merely furnishing examples of anti-Semitic libels. Thus, disproof literature published by Jews has provided source material for anti-Semitism. The conclusion is inescapable that disproof literature is not merely futile but most likely harmful.

### Better Methods of Defense

To approach the problem by issuing "straightforward information" requires more skill, more planning, more promotion, and more subtlety than does direct refutation. Consider, for example, the calumny propagated by the Nazis to the effect that American Jews have been evading military service. The disproof method of combating this slander would be to publicize the fact that

it was going the rounds, and with quotations from the slanderous statements there would be given figures, names, and facts to offset it. Fortunately this tactic has in the main not been employed. But the accusation has not been ignored. Service flags have been dedicated in Jewish institutions; stories of Jewish heroism have reached the public through the press; the part played by Jewish men and women in the effort of the United Nations is constantly being made known; that is, the facts—the positive facts—are permitted to speak for themselves.

It is imperative that Jews recognize the impossibility of creating a favorable stereotype of the Jew by changing a line here and there in caricatures drawn by anti-Semites. To concentrate on erasing one wrong impression or another, by direct disproof, only calls attention to—and thus re-emphasizes—the anti-Semite's picture of the Jew. The only sensible procedure is to superimpose on the public mind a better portrait, one based upon the positive features of the Jew.

### Raising Esteem for Jews

In the absorption of Jews and their friends in apologetics, which do not placate the unfriendly anyhow, many opportunities to heighten respect for Jews have been lost. Perhaps we lack writers who would devote themselves to the too little appreciated task of interpreting Juda-

ism and the Jews to the Christians. The describing of Jewish customs and ceremonies, Jewish home life, Jewish ethics, Jewish philanthropies, Jewish literature, the achievements in social welfare of outstanding Jews, and numerous other positive aspects of Jewish existence in America, requires resources of knowledge and considerable skill; such material must be interestingly written and neither boastful nor apologetic. In this, however, lies the greatest hope of diverting the minds of Jews and non-Jews alike from the slanderous things which are often said about Jews.

In what wealth of colorful detail could a group of people be limned who came to these shores as exploited refugees and acquired by their labor the status of free men and women! What lives have been lived by those who, barely knowing English, ventured out into the countryside to sell merchandise to farmers who could not otherwise have easily obtained it! What of Jewish merchants whose integrity was such that millions of persons learned to buy from their catalogues, certain that the goods reaching them would fully fit the description! Must we busy ourselves disproving the venomous things said by scoundrels when we might be telling of Jews whose lives assented positive, lasting, and humane values?

We shall get nowhere at all with disproof literature. It will use up

our funds stocking libraries with insults to Jews and replies to those insults, instead of directing attention to our achievements and social contributions. It is enough that those who are charged with protective responsibilities are aware of the defamations and that they publicize straightforward positive information which contradicts and offsets them. Let the average Jew and the average non-Jew who wants to know about Jews have more positive material available.

Any intelligent person readily understands that to argue the question of whether or not he is a scoundrel—no matter how many people are saying so—is inevitably to his own disadvantage. Sensible people and wise corporations are content to create the best impression they can instead of advertising insults they have received by trying to “answer” them.

American promoters of racial and religious hatred could not win here against a group that would thoroughly expose their motives, the sources of their funds, their ultimate aims, and the company they keep. If properly revealed, the schemes these agitators promote for their own personal gain, while parading as “public benefactors,” would shock the American public. Will the Jews carry on a needed offensive against the professional anti-Semites, or will they accept the status of weak scapegoats, bleating out pathetic disclaimers?

# An App.

## A TIME FOR MOURNING AND CONSECRATION

THE *Denver Post* recently rebuked the clergymen of that city who called on their people to observe Sunday, August 29—the day before registration for the draft—as a day of mourning and repentance. The article proposed that the clergymen be realistic and recognize that “Russia is the only threat to the peace of the world.” The *Post* also recommended that the day be made one of consecration and not one of mourning.

The conviction persists, however, that this is a time for mourning and repentance. We as a nation have done those things we ought not to have done and have left undone those things we ought to have done! The articles by James P. Warburg in this and the next issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS reveal how far short we have come of “doing righteousness” in foreign affairs. Sumner Wells in *We Need Not Fail*, a greatly important book, has thrown the light of moral judgment on one area of our disastrous foreign policy. His testimony supports those who declare that this is a time for repentance. Mr. Wells does not spare our policymakers who in their “realistic” handling of the Palestine problem (“dominated by the military mentality”), in the United Nations brought the United States to “a position as profoundly humiliating as any in its history.” “We are now using the United Nations as an instrument of our own national policy and fulfilling our obligations to the cause of collective security only when that seems to serve our own selfish national end.” “This bankruptcy of the Security Council has been due exclusively to the policies of selfish and short-sighted expediency pursued by Great Britain and still more by the United States.”

A day of mourning is not enough. May the call for repentance continue until our “get tough” policy, which daily gets us farther from peace, is repudiated. Let the draft be as a sign unto us—a dreadful reminder that we are plunging on a fatal course, seeking national security through the “unilateral imposition of force” instead of striving for collective security by faithfulness to the United Nations. As long as those prevail who propose by armed might to make America strong in policies that are “devoid of vision and devoid of principle” we have not brought forth fruits worthy of repentance. Consecration without repentance is calamitous—a hardening of heart, mind, and strength in an evil course. Let the Church call the nation to mourn, to godly sorrow which worketh repentance to salvation.

# 'to Faith

## "SHALL HE FIND FAITH ON THE EARTH?"

**A**ND that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. . . . For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required." A statesman examining our country's policy in Palestine with an honest and fearless intellect judges it as world-destroying. What is the verdict of the Christian conscience on our present course? Not a few today are being charged with unwisely resisting our nation in its course and thereby disloyally giving comfort to Russia. Communism is an immense evil destroying the lives and blighting the souls of men. But even when we have clearly seen the enormity of its offenses there still is not enough sin in Moscow for us to hide behind or to save us from God's judgment. We shall not escape because we are better than Russia.

The manner in which self-righteousness insinuates itself into our hearts and betrays our judgment is revealed by several recent events. The indignation of America was spurred by our policymakers and news reporters over the closing of the arteries of trade by Russia in the Berlin engagement of the "cold war." Many of us were quick to condemn Russia for her willingness to starve hundreds of thousands of citizens of Berlin. Our passion for the starving was doubted by those who knew of our course when political expediency and Christian morality did not agree. Our Congressmen and Senators last June reduced the item of sixty million dollars provided in ERP for the starving children of the world to thirty-five million dollars. The reason given for this reduction was that a large portion of the aid would reach the starving children behind the iron curtain! The Christian believes the child behind the iron curtain is as precious to the eternal Father as the child in his own home. Thus we dared offend "these little ones" and fashioned millstones for ourselves in the conduct of a "cold war."

We have been greatly blessed with wealth and freedom to do the will of God. God pity us if in this our day of world leadership we do not break the spell of militarism and our obsession with realism and cleverness! What excuse or shadow of an excuse can those have who by their lives confess that in critical issues they would not rely on the way of faith, mercy, and love. It is still required of stewards that a man be found faithful.

—Paul Newton Poling.

# THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD CRISIS

JAMES P. WARBURG'S *address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science.*

YOUR president, ladies and gentlemen, is a wise man. I say this because it was presumably he who designated as your over-all topic "How to Achieve One World."

Unfortunately, such wisdom is rare—especially among those who are today shaping the policy of the United States. Had any "bipartisan" advisers been asked to formulate the caption for this conference, the narrower and purely negative definition, "How to Stop Russia," would almost certainly have been suggested.

Make no mistake about it—there is going to be One World. There is going to be One World no matter what foreign policy we pursue. The only question is by which of three possible means our world is going to be unified. We shall shortly see either a Russian-dominated world, or an American-dominated world, or a world united under world law and governed peacefully on the federal principle.

At present, our policymakers apparently see only the threat of a Russian-dominated world—which, as things are going now, is a very real threat and a most unpleasant one to contemplate. But, in seeking

to forestall this danger, the makers of United States policy are unfortunately thinking in purely negative terms—in terms of "how to stop Russia." This means, in effect, that they are consciously or unconsciously thinking of an American-dominated world as the sole alternative. And this, in turn, means a rapid approach to a trial of physical strength between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Our policymakers are so preoccupied with stopping Russia that they have totally disregarded, or at least pushed into the background, the one constructive solution which is still possible—the solution of achieving one world through world government. I do not say that this solution can be easily or quickly attained. I do say that ultimately it is the only acceptable solution and that it will never be attained if we pursue our present course of action.

If we pursue our present course, it seems almost inevitable that we shall sooner or later come to an armed conflict with the Soviet Union. The chances are that we should win a war with Russia. But suppose we did win such a war—what should we

accomplish? We should, it is true, prevent a Russian-dominated world. But at what cost?

Let us assume that we could loose atomic and bacteriological destruction upon the Soviet Union without Russian retaliation upon the United States. The first thing the Russians would do would be to occupy all of Europe up to the Atlantic seaboard. There would be nothing to stop them. In the same way the Russians would occupy large parts of northern China and all of Korea. In order for us to force a Russian surrender, we should then have to pulverize not only the Russian centers of production but the cities of Europe as well—we should have to poison not only Russian crops and reservoirs but the crops and water supply of Europe and the Far East. And then let us be optimistic enough to imagine that we could force a Russian surrender without a costly invasion by our ground forces of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Can you picture the Western Hemisphere as an island of prosperity in such a world? Can you picture what it would mean to try to rebuild such a world? Can you imagine what it would involve to occupy and police the Soviet Union? Can you envisage what it would be like to be a member of the all-conquering American master race?

This would be the result of the cheapest victory we could win. To believe in so cheap a victory is al-

most to believe in miracles. This—or worse—will be the result of a continuation of our present foreign policy, which assumes that, if peaceful methods fail, we can always stop Russia by means of war.

What, then, is the alternative?

Certainly the alternative is not to fold our hands and do nothing. Nor is the alternative a policy of appeasement. Either of these courses would mean an unthinkable acceptance of a Soviet or Communist-dominated world, or else a war of doubtful outcome fought in desperation to preserve our independence at a time of Russia's choosing.

The alternative that I see is an awakening on our part to the true nature of the present world crisis—a jettisoning of our present foreign policy—and the rapid development of a substitute which could still save Western civilization from the suicide toward which it is now rushing under our leadership.

Mr. Truman's analysis on March 17, 1948, of the world crisis was contained in four brief statements, which I shall quote verbatim.

1. "The situation in the world today is not primarily the result of the natural difficulties which follow a great war. It is due chiefly to the fact that one nation has not only refused to co-operate in the establishment of a just and honorable peace, but—even worse—has actively sought to prevent it."

2. "The agreements we did obtain,

imperfect though they were, could have furnished the basis for a just peace—if they had been kept. But they were not kept. They were consistently ignored and violated by one nation."

3. "One nation has persistently obstructed the work of the United Nations."

4. "The Soviet Union and its agents have destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe. It is this ruthless course of action and the clear design to extend it to the remaining free nations of Europe that has brought about the critical situation of Europe today."

First I submit that a partial basis for a just and honorable peace was laid down in the Atlantic Charter and reaffirmed in the United Nations declaration of January, 1942. Russia, Great Britain, and the United States signed this declaration, along with all the other nations then fighting the Axis. Among other things, the signatories renounced territorial annexations and territorial changes which did not conform to the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. I submit that these pledges were abrogated at Teheran and Yalta, when the Western powers purchased Russian help in the war against Japan by agreeing to Soviet annexation of territory in Europe and Asia and to the division of the world into spheres of influence.

The historical fact is that the basis for a just and honorable peace—in so far as it ever existed—was thrown overboard by mutual consent before the war ended.

Further, I submit that we not only agreed at Yalta to allow Russia to violate the principles of a just peace, but that we ourselves have violated them by destroying our own project of international trusteeship in the former Japanese-mandated islands, by introducing the vindictive nonsense of the Morgenthau Plan into the German settlement, and by backing Churchill's restorationist intervention in Greece and elsewhere.

Finally—still speaking of the first count in the indictment—I suggest that the true nature of the world crisis is quite different and far more complicated than one might be led to believe by Mr. Truman's oversimplified analysis.

In the second charge, it is indicated that the agreements we did obtain, though imperfect, could have furnished the basis for a just peace—if they had been kept. But they were not kept. "They were consistently ignored and violated by one nation."

I have already expressed the conviction that the late wartime agreements not only failed to furnish the basis for a just peace but actually destroyed what basis had previously been created. Does anyone believe that the Potsdam Agreement for the postsurrender treatment of Germany

could by any stretch of the imagination have furnished the basis for a just peace? This was, after all, the major agreement reached after the European war ended. It was an agreement that sanctioned the annexation of German territory not only by Poland but by Russia, which permitted the forcible expulsion from their homes of some thirteen million Germans, which failed to fix Germany's western frontier and left the crucial problem of the Ruhr unsettled, which contained enough remnants of Morgenthauism to wreck the hopes of early European recovery, and which gave to one nation—France—a veto over all four-power action without making that nation a party to the agreement.

As to keeping agreements, it is true that Russia violated the ambiguous Yalta pledges for "free elections." It is also true that Russia violated the Potsdam Agreement. But it is not true that postwar agreements were "ignored and violated" by only one nation. The Potsdam Agreement, for example, was, first of all, ignored and violated by France, which refused to let it be carried out unless her demands for frontier revision in the West were first satisfied. Then, and only then, was it violated by the Soviet Union. Our own Military Government officials have confirmed this. Our own Military Government officials will also confirm that we ourselves violated and ignored the Potsdam Agreement by stopping

reparations in May, 1946, in a vain attempt to get France and Russia to see the error of their ways.

The third charge is that Russia alone has persistently obstructed the work of the United Nations. Russia has persistently vetoed, abstained, boycotted, and abused the United Nations as a forum for recrimination. But are all others innocent? What about the United States? Have we not undermined the authority of the United Nations by our unilateral action in China, in Greece, in Turkey, and in Italy? Have we not ignored the United Nations and set ourselves up in its place? And have we not just recently come perilously close to destroying the United Nations altogether by our incredible gyrations with regard to Palestine? I am concerned that we prevent ourselves from seeing the truth, at a time when only a clear recognition of the truth can save us from disaster.

We come now to the last charge, which consists of two parts. First: "The Soviet Union and its agents have destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe." So far as independence is concerned, I submit that not one of these little nations—except Finland—was ever really independent. Before the First World War all but two of them did not exist. Between the two world wars most of these little nations were members of the French-led Little Entente and de-

pended for their security upon the French Army. It is true that there is a vast difference in degree of independence under French protection and Soviet domination. But the Czechoslovakia of 1928 would have dared to offend France just as little as the Czechoslovakia of 1948 dares to offend the Soviet Union. The same thing is true of Yugoslavia. This has always been the fate of little nations in Europe. Furthermore, we ourselves agreed at Yalta to perpetuate this traditional pattern of dependence. We agreed to spheres of influence. One result of this agreement was that we let the Red Army liberate Czechoslovakia.

What about the destruction of the "democratic character" of these nations in the Soviet orbit? Most of these nations never had a truly "democratic character" to destroy. The only two countries now in the Soviet orbit that had a "democratic character" to destroy were Finland and Czechoslovakia. There is no doubt that the Communists have brutally destroyed this "democratic character" in Czechoslovakia. They probably will destroy it in Finland. This much of the charge is a true bill. It constitutes a much more powerful indictment of the Soviet-led Cominform when stripped of irrelevant and dubious generalizations.

Finally, is there, beyond peradventure of doubt, a clear design on the part of Russia to include all of Europe in her sphere of influence?

And, if so, is the threat one of conquest—in other words, to western Europe's independence? Or is it a revolutionary threat to internal security—to democracy? Or is it a combination of the two?

These are key questions. I cannot presume to answer them. I suggest only that they require far more study. I suggest only that Russian action to date could be explained on the basis of existing evidence as something quite different from a Hitlerian design for conquest. It could be explained as a gigantic disengagement operation, in which the basic aim is to tighten ruthlessly every nut and bolt in the security belt around the Soviet Union and then retire into complete isolation. There are authoritative anti-Communist students of Russian history and Russian policy who incline to this belief. There are also others who believe that Soviet expansionism is a fact, but that it derives at least as much from fear as from a desire to dominate Europe, and that the fear is largely a fear of the United States. This idea that we might attack the Soviet Union is widespread in Europe and Asia, and not only in the Soviet orbit. Without doubt, recent developments in Washington have added to its credibility.

*In the next issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS, Dr. Warburg will summarize our present policy and suggest a different analysis of the world problem.*

# *Christian Action*

---

## CITIZENSHIP

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

(For use with Voting Record)

One important piece of business was accomplished in the much-debated special session of Congress after the political conventions—namely, the authorization of the 65-million-dollar loan to the United Nations for its New York headquarters. The other two pieces of legislation on anti-inflation and housing were both indeed far short of any position taken by the Presbyterian Church in either of these fields at any time. Housing in particular must be regarded as the great casualty of the 80th Congress.

### DISPLACED PERSONS (PUBLIC LAW 774)

Congressmen who favored a good displaced persons bill (the Fellows Bill) were faced in the final days of the session with passage of the Wiley Bill or nothing; hence they chose the Wiley Bill. Therefore one of the first pieces of business for the next Congress will be to improve this legislation. It is very important how any Congressman you elect thinks on this problem. It may be summed up as follows:

1. It keeps the cutoff date at December 22, 1945.
2. It provides that 30 per cent of the DP's must be farmers, and 40 per cent from eastern Poland and the Baltic states.
3. It permits "Volksdeutsche" to enter this country under the regular German quota for two years, up to 50 per cent of that quota for that period.
4. Each DP must have assured to him a job and a home prior to entry here.

5. The 15,000 DP's now here on a temporary basis may apply for permanent residence.

6. Immigration under the terms of this bill will be charged up to each country's future immigration to the extent of 50 per cent each year until the total number is made up.

7. With the 200,000 initially provided for, plus the 2,000 Czechs, and 3,000 orphans permitted to enter, a maximum number of 205,000 DP's (aside from the 15,000 DP's allowed to remain here) may come into the United States for permanent residence under this bill.

An evaluation of this law was issued by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons (with which our Division has been co-operating). We quote:

"The adoption in the bill of the cutoff date of December 22, 1945, is deliberate discrimination against the overwhelming majority of Jewish DP's and others who fled their countries to escape terror after that date. The special priority for DP's from annexed countries is likewise discriminatory against equally deserving DP's of other nationalities.

"The discriminations on racial and religious grounds against the victims of the Nazis are all the more shocking when we consider that one of the provisions of this bill actually permits persons of German ethnic origin to immigrate to this country under the regular German quota. This is a clear departure from the basic principles on which our immigration law has rested. The acceptance of the concept of blood and race is a victory for Hitler's philosophy.

"The American people will never condone such a departure from the basic concepts of democracy. Already our leaders in both foreign and domestic policy have promised amendments to blot out the bigotry in the measure at the earliest possible moment. Responsible legislators recognize that this bill not only excludes many DP's from consideration but also mortgages the lives of unborn children for generations to come and jeopardizes our precious store of good will throughout the world.

"We know that Americans, with their innate sense of decency and fair play, will want to join this committee in calling for the earliest possible action to change the bill from a threat to democracy to a humanitarian measure worthy of the greatest nation on earth."

### THE FISCAL BUDGET

The President issued a revised budget in August. According to United Press sources, the following is of interest (all figures in billions) :

<i>Budget receipts</i> 1948 actual	\$44,486
Jan., 1948 estimate	44,402
Aug., 1948 revision	40,658
<i>Budget expenditures</i> (revised)	
Aug., 1948)	
National defense	\$12,140
International affairs and finance	7,010
Veterans' services and benefits	6,791
Social welfare, health, and security	2,009
Housing and community facilities	327
Education and general research	86
Agriculture and agricultural resources	868
Natural resources not primarily agricultural	1,586
Transportation & communication	1,835
Finance, commerce, and industry	77
Labor	98
General government	1,187
Interest on the public debt	5,300

Refunds or receipts	2,789
Reserve for contingencies	100
Adjustment to daily treasury statement basis.....minus	
Total budget expenditures	42,203

### INTERNATIONAL WHEAT PACT

In view of the interest of the Church in finding positive steps toward peace as well as our basic command to feed the hungry, we need ask why Senator Vandenberg for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee announced both at the regular session and again in August that the ratification of the World Wheat Pact be delayed. The reason given was that there wasn't time to give it sufficient study. This is reminiscent of another time when the U. S. decided to by-pass the United Nations, the first by-pass, namely, the World Food Fund which was to have followed UNRRA. Remember, the United States preferred to give individual relief country by country.

This World Wheat Pact was sent to Congress by the President on April 30 (in the form of a treaty—only Senate ratification required) with the notice that ratification was required by July 1, 33 importing countries and Canada, Australia, and the United States as exporting nations. Plan is to export wheat at between \$1.50 and \$2 per bushel the first year, with a 10-cent lower "floor" each year until it is \$1.10 in 1952. Exporting countries would each be committed to a specified quantity. For the U. S., the amount is 185 million bushels; Australia, 85 million bushels; Canada, 230 million bushels a year for the next five years.

The U. S. has second largest wheat crop of all time this year—1,200 million bushels. And the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers for an 8 per cent reduction in next year's wheat acreage. Domestic consumption will probably reach 775 million bushels. Thus the 185 million bushels for export, plus over 150 million bushels of military ex-

ports would take up about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of U. S. surplus.

In view of the European Recovery Program, is an international wheat agreement necessary? The answer seems to be that the agreement would get the machinery started to assure a foreign market for U. S. wheat that would carry over after ERP ends. However, an equally pertinent answer is that the agreement would eliminate the disadvantages to U. S. wheat producers and to foreign relations in general growing out of two-country contracts which worked to the detriment of our own farmers in 1930. Food is basic in all international co-operation and about half the world considers wheat its basic commodity. This is another avenue open for international co-operation.

In August Senator Vandenberg last reported for his committee deciding against immediately reporting favorably on the agreement, but saying they favor the principle. The reasons given were (1) that application of the agreement would require authorized legislation of both houses since it calls for a *possible* subsidy through CCC that *might* reach 150 million dollars in some years; (2) that signatory nations have withdrawn so that treaty could not become effective anyway.

It should be pointed out that our delay has caused five of the signatories—England, Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, and Denmark—to withdraw their ratification. However, the assumption is that if the United States finally ratifies, these nations will come back. Argentina and Russia did not sign.

In the hearings held by the Senate committee last spring farm interests strongly endorsed the agreement while milling and other processing interests opposed.

## NOVEMBER AND ELECTION

Remember, we elect a President in November, BUT we also elect *all* members of the House of Representatives and 32

Senators. *Your vote speaks.* (The Division of SEA can supply material for a class in citizenship if you are interested.)

## VOTING RECORDS OF THE 80TH CONGRESS

Voting records of the 80th Congress were mailed to every minister and to all presbytery and presbyterial Social Education and Action officers early in September.

Suggestions for their use were found in the September issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Following are suggestions for reference material on each of the various bills which the Voting Record covers.

Copies of the Voting Record may be ordered from the Division of Social Education and Action.

Order all materials direct from addresses given.

### Foreign Policy (Economic)

See Voting Record.

Aid to Greece and Turkey, S. 938.

Foreign Relief, H. J. Res. 153.

Interim Foreign Aid, S. 1774.

European Recovery Program.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements, H. R. 6556.

Also see "Review of 80th Congress" and item on "International Children's Fund," September issue SOCIAL PROGRESS.

See June index SOCIAL PROGRESS. Look up under subject.

### Pamphlets

1. *Reciprocal Trade Policy and European Recovery*, Committee on International Economic Policy, 405 West 117th Street, New York 27, N. Y. Free.

2. *Reciprocal Trade Agreements*, by J. M. Letiche, Committee on International Economic Policy, 405 West 117th Street, New York 27, N. Y. 50 cents.

3. *Outline of European Recovery Program*, December 19, 1947. Draft legislation and background information. Secure from your Congressman.

4. *Memo—Economic Steps Toward*

*Peace, League of Women Voters*, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. 10 cents.

5. *Can We Be Free from Want?*, National Institute of Social Relations, Inc., 1244 20th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 10 cents.

6. *World Affairs Discussion Program*. Order from Foreign Policy Association, 22 West 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. \$1.

### Foreign Policy (Military)

See Voting Record.

1. Selective Service, the Shafer amendment, voted June 17, 1947.

2. Selective Service, final vote on draft.

### Pamphlets

1. *Minority Views*, Selective Service Act of 1948, House Armed Services Committee. Order from your own Congressman.

2. *Swords of Peace*, Number 64. 35 cents.

*Forging a New China*, Number 67. 35 cents.

*Russia—Menace or Promise?* Number 58. 25 cents.

Order the above from The Foreign Policy Association, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y.

3. *The Two Day War of 1968*, The National Council Against Conscription, 1013 18th Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

4. *Instead of Rearmament and War*, Baptist Council for Christian Social Progress, 1751 N. Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. \$1.25 per hundred.

5. *An Analysis of the Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training*, July 7, 1947. Westminster Book Stores, or Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. 10 cents.

6. *The Militarization of America*, National Council Against Conscription, 1013 18th Street, Washington 6, D. C. 10 cents.

7. *Selective Service Act of 1948*, June 19.

Secure from your Congressman. *Free*.

8. *The Price Asked for U. M. T. Free*.

9. *Let's Put First Things First. Free*.

Order from National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

### Foreign Policy (People)

See Voting Record.

Displaced Persons, H. R. 6396.

### Pamphlets

1. *Displaced Persons in Europe*. Report of the Committee on the Judiciary. Secure from your Congressman.

2. *International Migration and One World*. National Committee on Immigration Policy, 36 West 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y. 25 cents.

3. *Naturalization and Immigration Report on Hearings*, Serial #18, Committee on Judiciary Provision for Equality Under Naturalization and Immigration Laws, April 19 and 21, 1948. Secure from own Congressman.

### Domestic Policy

See Voting Record.

1. Wool Support Bill, S. 814.

2. Anti-poll Tax, H. R. 29.

3. Taft-Hartley Labor Bill, H. R. 3020.

4. Anti-inflation, J. J. Res. 167.

5. Regional Compact in Education, H. J. Res. 334.

6. Registration of Communists and Communist-Front Organizations, Mundt-Nixon Bill, H. R. 5852.

### Pamphlets

1. *A Housing Program . . . for Now and Later*, National Public Housing Conference, 1015 Fifteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 25 cents.

2. *Housing*. Bibliography on public housing and related subjects. Order from National Housing Agency, Federal Public Housing Authority, Washington, D. C. *Free*.

3. *Housing Covenants*. Recent study by

American Missionary Association. Published by Fisk University Press, Nashville, Tenn.

4. *F. E. P. C. Reference Manual*, 1948 edition. Order from the Committee on Employment Discrimination of the National Community Relations Advisory Council, 295 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. 50 cents.

5. *To Secure These Rights*. The report of the President's Committee on Civil

Rights, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. \$1.

6. *These Rights Are Ours to Keep*. Public Affairs Pamphlet. Order from Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

7. *Small Farm and Big Farm*, Number 100. Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. 10 cents.

—Fern M. Colborn.

## RACIAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

### THE SEARCH FOR BROTHERHOOD

Registration is open for qualified delegates to attend an Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations to be held in Philadelphia November 29 to December 3. Total registration will not exceed 25. Applicants must be communicant members of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and engaged in activities of church, church-related institutions, or the community. A working knowledge of race relations is required.

The program of the Institute will be designed to qualify delegates to spearhead local action in behalf of a nonsegregated church and society. Scholarships covering train travel and residence expenses are available. Qualified experts in intergroup relations will review tested procedures. Institutional officers will be present to discuss the procedures for integration. Panels and discussion groups will explore areas of tension in race relations. Field trips will include visits to interracial churches, Fellowship House, Fellowship Commission, hospitals, schools, housing projects, and to the Presby-

terian Board of Christian Education.

Write to Rev. William H. McConaghy, Director of Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. State position, activities, and how you expect to utilize knowledge gained. Middle and far Western delegates are invited to apply at the same time for the Institute to be held in January, probably in California.

\* \* \*

When the Y. M. C. A. of Philadelphia needed a new secretary last winter it determined to employ the best qualified person regardless of race, which resulted in bringing the first Negro to their staff. Adhering to the same steps usually followed in engaging new secretaries, there was no discussion or consultation concerning her arrival, but only an announcement of the fine qualifications which led to her choice for the position. There were those who said "the time was not ripe"; but because of her friendly and natural personality, the new employee was quickly accepted and soon set a new standard of fine workmanship for the entire office.

—William H. McConaghy.

# Sanctuary

---

## Prayers for Worship on World Order Sunday, October 24, 1948

*The year 1948 has been an extremely tense year in international relations. It has seen the fear of another war rise and fall and rise again as one crisis after another created an uneasy belligerence in the minds of our people. It has seen our nation adopt the method of militarism to preserve the peace. It has seen a growing distrust of the United Nations; indeed, there may be cynical smiles on the faces and crossed fingers behind the backs of some who observe World Order or United Nations Sunday this year because they think the observance is only lip service to a fading, impotent ideal.*

*If this is the mood controlling our congregations in October, 1948, how great is the responsibility of Christian people to destroy it, not through piously mouthed platitudes but through positive action! The prayers that follow are a contribution to that constructive program as they use the elements of worship for the molding of thought and to express to Almighty God the honest attitudes and sincere longings of his people.*

### **Prayer of Confession:**

O God who dost rule the world with justice, punishing the disobedient and forgiving the penitent and ignorant, we come confessing our part in the world's sin and sorrow. We realize that the uncertainty of these days, the numb terror that paralyzes the people in war-searred lands, and the blind devotion of our nation to the strong-arm methods of force lay sins of selfishness, indifference, and arrogance to our charge. We know how we have encouraged the discontent and discord among the dispossessed peoples of the world because we have been preoccupied with our own problems and have stubbornly followed our wills rather than thine. We have not humbled ourselves as we ought, we have not sacrificed as we should, we have not trusted thy way enough, we have not prayed as we must. Forgive us, O God, and as we lift our penitent hearts unto thee again, marveling at the mystery of thy always-recurring forgiveness, send us forth truly turned from sin and resolute in the way of righteousness. In the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

### **A Bidding Prayer of Supplication for Instruction in the Ways That We Can Promote the Peace:**

*The minister may introduce this prayer in these words: "Let us pray on this World Order Sunday that the Christians of the United States of America may take the lead in pursuing a positive program for peace - a program that will dispel the fear and hysteria threatening us and our brethren in these uncertain days."*

### **The Petition:**

Let us first ask God most earnestly to keep us from assuming that only war can solve our problems.

### **The Spoken Prayer:**

Everlasting God, through thy Son thou hast called blessed all who seek the way of peace; help us, therefore, to know this blessedness as we resolutely refuse to believe

that man—created in thy own image—is only capable of brandishing a sword and threatening with his fist when trouble comes. Thou hast planted souls in each of us—help us to love that gift so greatly that we will refuse to injure our fellow men because they too bear that gift. Thou hast endowed us with minds and sweet reasonableness; empower us to use this endowment as thou dost intend it to be used, not for the devising of destruction, but for the pursuit of peace.

#### **The Petition:**

Let us beseech God to give us the self-control which refuses to be coerced by screaming headlines and which is open-eyed about blind hatred.

#### **The Spoken Prayer:**

Creator God, we need to stand in thy schoolroom again to be humbled by the realization that the world's destiny rests ultimately with thee and not with us. We need to learn that self-control rooted in God-control is the Christian mood; we need an indifference to the passing cries and shouts that would deter us from our course. And how desperately we need, our Father, not to hate any man but to hate only the sin that is common to him and to us! By submitting us to thy discipline, dear God, make us the leaders in the things that make for peace.

#### **The Petition:**

Let us ask God to show us how we can promote the things that will make for peace: greater economic well-being for all men, a strong emphasis on social welfare, more secure human rights for those at home and abroad and a determined use of the methods of international conversation and negotiation in securing a righteous peace.

#### **The Spoken Prayer:**

O Lord our God, we realize our ignorance and the limits of our sight: enable us, therefore, to depend more consciously and willingly on thy guidance in the decisions we face and in our daily relations with all our brethren in thy great family. May the men and women directly responsible for the plans upon which peace depends likewise listen to thy voice and follow where it leads. To that end stir us in indignation against injustice, distress, exploitation, and belligerency and make us the means whereby these things may be erased from the fair world thou hast made.

#### **Prayer of Intercession:**

"Let Thy mercy, O God, rest upon our land and nation, upon all in authority, that there may be justice and peace at home and that we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. Break the power of unbelief and superstition, and preserve to us Thy pure Word, in its liberty and glory, to the end of our days.

"O Heavenly Father, we commend to Thy merciful care all who are in any wise afflicted. Relieve those who suffer; restore health and strength, as Thou dost will, to those who are sick. In Christ, let the heavy-laden find strength to endure and those who are in the valley of the shadow see the light of life eternal. Give to those in sorrow or loneliness the assurance that nothing can ever separate them from Thy love, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen."—From The Book of Common Worship, 1946. (Adapted.)

—Prepared by George L. Hunt, Assistant Director, Department of Adult Work,  
Presbyterian Board of Christian Education.

# About Books

---

**The Church, the Gospel, and War,**  
edited by Rufus M. Jones. Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

This is a book that might well be called the last will and testament of that great spirit who had so much to leave us, Rufus M. Jones. He was its editor, and his introduction, although short, presents us with a strong statement of his philosophy and faith. It bequeathes to us his undaunted conviction that the time will come when all men will "beat their swords into plowshares"; and gives us this task: "We must pull out every stop in the effort to check the encroachment of the military forces in America, and everywhere else. We must produce everywhere we can an international consciousness, promoting and strengthening the United Nations. We must go to Christ as our leader and interpreter of life and not to Church experts who favor compromise and adjustment."

The reader is bombarded with eleven strong arguments for pacifism by leading American and British thinkers. The contributions are well selected, a number of them having appeared previously as chapters in books or as magazine articles. Both the history and the philosophy of pacifism are well covered. There are telling indictments of war.

The contents, however, are so confined to pacifism that it would be more representative to have the word appear in the title. Much has been omitted that should have been included in a book with a title so comprehensive. War, which is more often a symptom, was dealt with as if it were always a cause.

There is an oversimplification of the

issues. For example, several of the writers draw the lesson of pacifism from their belief that the cross is God's sole method of dealing with evil, but ignore much of the total dealings of God with sinful men, and of his methods in the enforcement of righteousness.

Although the writers are all very positive about their pacifist position, their spirit is such as to allow the nonpacifist to work with them in peacemaking. Indeed, several have admitted the need of police power, and, with proper qualifications, do not find this inconsistent with pacifism.

For understanding, for inspiration, and to face again the problem of the Christian attitude toward war, all should read this representative presentation of the pacifist's answer.

*R. Murray Jones.*

**The Plight of Freedom,** by Paul Scherer. Harper & Brothers. \$2.50.

France's illustrious son, Alexis de Tocqueville, reflecting on his extended visit to the United States about a hundred years ago, said: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her rich mines and her vast world commerce; it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her free public schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her matchless Constitution and democratic Congress; it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand. . . . America is great because America is good. If America ever ceases to be good, it will cease to be great."

Dr. Paul Scherer might not agree with the theology implicit in de Tocqueville's remarks, nor might he narrow their application to our own country, but he would certainly agree with their spirit. "I am not worried about the dawn of conscience, I am worried about its twilight," he says in his most recent book, *The Plight of Freedom*. And it is in an effort to set forth the sources and nature of this flower freedom, which we profess to prize so much, that he has written his present volume.

Many of the ideas are not new, but, as Dr. Scherer himself suggests in the preface, the fundamental questions involved are so important in this day that they cannot be raised too often or too insistently. The "plight" is that we have misunderstood both the nature and root of freedom. We have failed to realize that freedom does not concern itself primarily with the things *from* which we wish to be free, but the things *for* which we wish to be free.

Our secular freedoms have begun to deteriorate because the spiritual freedoms upon which they in turn rest have been neglected. It is Dr. Scherer's thesis that these secular freedoms are like manna from heaven: they cannot be gathered on one day for use the next. Therefore to assure ourselves of the continued presence of these freedoms we must not gather the perishable manna, trying vainly to preserve it until later, but rather ourselves remain in the spiritual climate where manna will flourish. To this end he asserts that we must understand where our freedoms have their roots: in a God whose sovereignty we have forgotten; in a mankind whose dignity we have despised; in the will of God to which our consciences have become insensitive; in the fellowship of the Church and the brotherhood of man; and in the lost challenge of the fulfillment in love of the highest possible good through the power of our Lord Jesus Christ.

How shall we be saved? Dr. Scherer's answer is the traditional Christian one. It is through the surrender of self to God. "Make me a captive, Lord, and then I shall be free." It is in the thrusting of self into the torrent of life. It is through the end of the role of the spectator and the beginning of the role of participant in all areas of living—not just a seventh of life. It is in the singing heart of the Gospel. It is in the development of God's creative forgiveness in ourselves. "Love us black," goes an old saying, "when we are white everybody loves us." The love we are to show one another is the same, scar by scar, that has been shown us by the Christ.

There can be little argument with Dr. Scherer's statements. Certainly the essential ones can be documented with Scripture and the tests of history. Not to read this book, especially the chapters on "The Interminable Quest" and "The Savior of Life," would be to deprive oneself of Paul Scherer's genuine insight into the human scene. The lightning flashes of a turned phrase or the even illumination of a floodlighted thought bring to the reader a new vision of what our Christian faith can mean in the world, in the nation, and in our own un-ordered lives. Dr. Scherer brings the old message of two thousand years and makes it relevant to today.

—Dugald Chaffee.

**The Silent People Speak**, by Robert St. John. Doubleday & Company, Inc. \$4.00.

No special knowledge of Yugoslavia is necessary to enjoy Robert St. John's book about the "silent people." It tells of man—the common man—how he lives and what he thinks. Although the "new government," Marshal Tito, and the aftermaths of war are discussed as they affect and dominate the lives of the Yugoslavs, the book is in no sense a political one.

Returning to the Balkans after the war, St. John spent months wandering through the six Yugoslavian republics, searching out men and women who could give him a picture of life as it was being lived. Not interested in "proving anything," he reports in an impartial way what he "saw and heard and smelled." He observed a sense of destiny, a new hope, as the silent people speak.

—*Mrs. John Prideaux.*

**Our Threatened Values**, by Victor Gollancz. Henry Regnery Company. \$2.50.

"This realistic and deeply moving book, the most important piece of English political writing to appear since the end of the war, has shaken political thought in England to its foundations." So says the publisher.

Doubtless most of us have developed strong resistance to publishers' blurbs and reviewers' repeated insistences that "this is a must book." But this reader must say that for him the reading of this little volume has been a spiritual experience. Here is the authentic voice of a prophet of God—not preaching idealism in a vacuum, but in most concrete detail warning us of the dangers in our present course and pointing the right way to go.

The essence of the author's analysis is summarized in the last paragraph of the book:

"We face a moral crisis graver, perhaps, than the physical crisis of the war. There are two paths for the human race, and it must choose between them. One, that of greed and hatred and self-interest, will end by turning us, with or without the atom bomb, into something less than human; the other may take us, or our children's children, to heights of splendor—in body, mind, and spirit—of which today we can hardly dream. Cannot we lead men, and quickly, to the better of these paths?"

What are "our threatened values"? "The central value, that includes all other

values, is respect for personality . . . which recognizes the essential spiritual equality of all human beings." Loss of respect for personality in the actual dealings of men and nations with each other, and not the atom bomb, is the major threat to our civilization.

The heart of the book stems from two political and moral judgments:

"I am certain that it is in the spread of what is today called communism, and in the growing power throughout Europe of Soviet Russia, that the strongest positive forces opposed to the stability and development of our western civilization are now to be found. I am certain also that British behavior towards Germany . . . is doing more than anything else to facilitate the spread of communism and to strengthen the power of the Soviet Union."

The author gives a brilliant analysis of how the impressive ideal of Communism has become increasingly corrupted because "in the human interplay it is means and not ends that are the effective reality."

Then follows a sixty-page documentation of the ways in which Britain and her allies are actually pursuing a very different policy in the critical testing ground of Germany. He describes "a whole people in a state of spiritual ruin such as has never been known, perhaps, in the history of the world" and the essence of their ruin is that in them respect for personality has been systematically destroyed. Our political and moral responsibility requires that we effect a complete psychological transformation of the German people.

Victor Gollancz is an English publicist with the moral insight and practical idealism of a prophet. Although a Jew, he repeatedly asserts the moral supremacy of Jesus and then in most specific terms describes what the Spirit of Jesus requires in our social life. Whether or not this is "the most important book since the war," the reading of it is a deeply moving experience.

—*John Maxwell Adams.*

**The Bell Ringers**, by Vern Swartsfager. The Macmillan Company. \$3.00.

"I'd fight for any kid! He's worth it!" declared Vern Swartsfager, hard-hitting young curate of St. Matthew's Cathedral in the Episcopal Diocese of Dallas. He backed up his words with action that captured the loyalty of the Royal Legion Blackshirts and transformed a potential gang of young criminals into his Gremlin Club. Inspired by him, they set out to become "tough" by doing the hard things that developed muscle and character and spiritual power. His Gremlins became the spearhead of "Kids' World, Inc.," whose aim is to strike hard at the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Padre Swartsfager, however, does not believe in juvenile delinquency. Kids themselves are basically good, he says. It is the parents who are delinquent. The quip is old, but the documentation is fresh as he tells the story of "The Bell Ringers." The book is a challenge not only to parents and to teen-agers, but to the whole Christian Church. Any reader who has been complacent about his work with young people needs to see whether he can top this one.

—Barnett S. Eby.

---

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"Universal Training for Democracy" is used with permission of *The New York Times* and Chester Bowles.

"Strategy of Error" is used with permission of the author, Director of Community Service of the American Jewish Committee. It is reprinted from *Contemporary Jewish Record*, February, 1945.

"The United States and the World Crisis" is published with the permission of the author.

#### Study and Action

**Christian Social Action**, Report of the Standing Committee on Social Education and Action of the General Assembly of 1948. Free.

**How Did Your Senators and Congressmen vote in 1947 and 1948?** Voting records of members of the 80th Congress have been mailed to local pastors and SEA officers. Their records cover the vote on sixteen major bills in both Houses. Free.

**Alcohol, Cats and People**, by Dr. E. M. Jellinek. Reprint from *Allied Youth*. Free.

**A Primer on Alcohol**, prepared by the Council on Christian Social Progress of the Northern Baptist Convention. 5 cents.

The above four items may be obtained from the Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa., or from Westminster Book Stores.

**Let's Talk It Over**, by Dr. Howard Y. McClusky. Free. Excellent source material for those planning to conduct periods of group discussion. Additional copies may be secured by writing to the Standard Oil Company, Room 1626, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y.

---

**GOWNS**

**PULPIT • CHOIR**

**CONFIRMATION**

**BAPTISMAL**

**DOCTORS**

**MASTERS**

**BACHELORS**

**CAPS GOWNS AND HOODS**

**BENTLEY & SIMON**

**7 WEST 36 ST • NEW YORK 18, N.Y.**



*At last . . .  
a Bible that laymen  
can really enjoy . . .*

THE WESTMINSTER  
*Study Edition*  
*of*  
THE HOLY BIBLE

This is not "just another Bible." In one easily handled volume it provides the layman with helps that would otherwise be available only in well-stocked libraries of religious books.

- \* In addition to the familiar King James text in full, the history of the Old and New Testaments is given.
- \* Each book of the Bible is preceded by an article that describes how it came to be written and discusses its particular message.
- \* Unusual footnotes not only clarify obscure words, but also offer material that gives the reader a feeling for the basic unity of the Bible.
- \* An extensive concordance and a set of maps in full color are included.

\$10.00

For full information ask for  
the free illustrated prospectus.

*Westminster Book Stores*  
(formerly Presbyterian Book Stores)

Philadelphia . New York . Chicago  
Los Angeles . . . . . San Francisco